



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,679	05/31/2001	Martin John Millmore	19111.0057	7209
23517	7590	11/02/2004	EXAMINER	
SWIDLER BERLIN SHEREFF FRIEDMAN, LLP			LUU, MATTHEW	
3000 K STREET, NW			ART UNIT	
BOX IP			PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20007			2672	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/867,679

Applicant(s)

MARTIN MILLMORE

Examiner

LUU MATTHEW

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 6/18/04 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Norden-Paul et al (5,410,704).

Regarding claim 1, Norden-Paul et al discloses (Figs. 3, 4, and 18A-18C) a system for controlling the appearance of a data entry form on a display which it is connected for use in entering data into a database (115, 116), the system comprising a store for storing attribute data (attribute look up table) defining attributes of a data entry form (form manager 111); and a controller (application program 114 and forms manager 111) for causing the data entry form to be displayed on a display in accordance with the stored attribute data, and for monitoring data values entered into the data entry field (column 6, line 49 to column 7, line 28); comparing the data value with prestored data values for data entry field (column 7, lines 39-40), if a match is found, displaying a corresponding further data entry field according to the stored attribute data (column 7, lines 38-48; and column 17, line 22 to column 19, line 5).

Norden-Paul et al clearly teaches the data entry field with a first data value (column 7, lines 7, lines 38-40, "In operation, objects are entered through input device

Art Unit: 2672

112 to the forms manager. This input is checked and stored in database 116"). It is inherent that a form has a plurality of data entry fields. If a match found, displaying a corresponding further data entry field according to the stored attribute data (column 7, lines 39-49, "This input is checked and stored in database 116...The forms manager then retrieves the display tiles (data entry fields) associated with the objects from database 115. The data to be placed in the tiles is then obtained from database 116. Using these inputs, forms manager 111 develops a form, which is displayed on display 113").

Regarding claim 2, Norden-Paul discloses (Fig. 4) the controller (forms manager 111 and application program 114) is adapted to enable a user to define the content of the store (column 7, lines 39-49, "This input is checked and stored in database 116...The forms manager then retrieves the display tiles (data entry fields) associated with the objects from database 115. The data to be placed in the tiles is then obtained from database 116. Using these inputs, forms manager 111 develops a form, which is displayed on display 113").

Regarding claim 3, Norden-Paul et al discloses (Figs. 3, 4, and 18A-18C) a method for controlling the appearance of a data entry form on a display which it is connected for use in entering data into a database (115, 116), the system comprising a store for storing attribute data (attribute look up table) defining attributes of a data entry form (form manager 111); and a controller (application program 114 and forms manager 111) for causing the data entry form to be displayed on a display in accordance with the stored attribute data, and for monitoring data values entered into the data entry field

Art Unit: 2672

(column 6, line 49 to column 7, line 28); comparing the data value with prestored data values for data entry field (column 7, lines 39-40), if a match is found, displaying a corresponding further data entry field according to the stored attribute data (column 7, lines 38-48; and column 17, line 22 to column 19, line 5).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norden-Paul et al (5,410,704).

Regarding claim 4, the only difference between the disclosure of Norden-Paul et al and the claimed invention is that the claim 4 requires the data entry field accepts and address style data value and an address entry field. However, it is obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that many forms and electronic application forms have data entry field that a user can input his/her name, address, phone numbers, email address, etc.

Regarding claim 5, Norden-Paul further teaches the data value entered into one data entry field (column 7, lines 39-49, "The forms manager then retrieves the display tiles (data entry fields) associated with the objects from database 115. The data to be

Art Unit: 2672

placed in the tiles is then obtained from database 116. Using these inputs, forms manager 111 develops a form, which is displayed on display 113").

Regarding claims 6 and 12, note the rejection as set forth above with respect to claim 4.

Regarding claims 7, 8, and 11, note the rejection as set forth above with respect to claim 5.

Regarding claims 9 and 10, note the rejection as set forth above with respect to claim 4.

Regarding claims 13-15, which are correspondent to claims 7-9 above. Please note the rejections as set forth above with respect to claims 7-9.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed June 8, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument, on page 8, lines 15-18, that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the form or report displayed may vary depending upon the value entered in the cell) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Art Unit: 2672

Norden-Paul clearly teaches the data entry field with a first data value (column 7, lines 7, lines 38-40, "In operation, objects are entered through input device 112 to the forms manager. This input is checked and stored in database 116"). It is inherent that a form has a plurality of data entry fields. If a match found, displaying a corresponding further data entry field according to the stored attribute data (column 7, lines 39-49, "This input is checked and stored in database 116...The forms manager then retrieves the display tiles (data entry fields) associated with the objects from database 115. The data to be placed in the tiles is then obtained from database 116. Using these inputs, forms manager 111 develops a form, which is displayed on display 113").

Regarding the new claims 4-15, note the new ground of rejection as set forth above with respect to claims 4-15 above.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2672

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUU MATTHEW whose telephone number is (703) 305-4850. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 hrs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, RAZAVI MICHAEL can be reached on (703) 305-4713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Luu



MATTHEW LUU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER